

13. (Withdrawn) A storable transfer conveyor system as described in claim 11 comprising:

- a. said storable transfer conveyor has powered rollers; and
- b. said storable transfer conveyor includes electrical power cables and power control lines connecting said storable transfer conveyor and said bundle breaker machine which need not be disconnected and reconnected when said storable transfer conveyor is moved from said first operative position to said second stored position or back again to said first operative position.

14. (Withdrawn) A storable transfer conveyor system as described in claim 13 comprising:

- a. a projection member operably mounted on said storable transfer conveyor; and
- b. a stop member operably mounted on said bundle breaker machine for contacting said projection member for preventing said storable transfer conveyor from falling to said floor area when said storable transfer conveyor is moved from said second stored position to said first operative position.

REMARKS

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 was objected to because of informalities. Claim 1 has been canceled. The informalities in claim 1 were corrected. All of the elements and corrections to claim 1 have been added to claim 2 by amendment. The amendments to claim 2 are shown in the Listing of Claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

2. The Examiner correctly states the statute.
3. Claim 1 was rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by Chen et al. (5,568,857). Claim 1 has been canceled and all the elements of claim 1 have been inserted into claim 2 as noted in the List of Claims and as set forth below.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 2, 7-9, and 11,12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form and amended to include all of the elements of claim 1 as noted in the List of Claims and should now be in form for allowance. Claim 7 is dependent on currently amended claim 2 and should be in form for allowance. Claim 8 is dependent on claim 7 which in turn is dependent on currently amended claim 2 and should now be in form for allowance. Claim 9 is dependent on claim 8 which is dependent on claim 7 which is dependent on currently amended claim 2 and should now be in form for allowance. Claim 11 is dependent on claim 9 which is dependent on claim 8 which is dependent on claim 7 which is dependent on claim currently amended claim 2 and should now be in form for allowance. Claim 12, is dependent on claim 11 which is dependent on claim 9 which is dependent on claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7 which is dependent on currently amended claim 2 and should now be in form for allowance.

Response to Arguments

5. The Examiner states that Applicant's arguments filed on 1/12/06 in response to the Examiner's Office action dated 9/14/05 are moot with respect to claims 1-2, 7-9 and 11-12 in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant concurs. Applicant further believes that no arguments with respect to the new grounds of rejection citing Chen (5,568,857) are required in view of the fact that Applicant has made all of the corrections to meet all of the Examiner's objections and the fact that the Examiner, in paragraph 4 of his letter of 4/5/06 has stated that claims 2, 7-9, and 11-12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant believes he has complied with this requirement. Applicant further agrees with the Examiner's statement of allowability set forth in paragraph 4 of his letter dated 4/5/2006. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that claims 2,

7-9, and 11,12 are now in form for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

- 6 Applicant has studied the art made of record and is in agreement that it should be made of record and considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant further agrees with the Examiner's decision that none of the patents made of record should be the basis of rejection under the statutes of any of the claims presently presented.

Final Action

- 7 The Examiner in his letter dated 4/5/2006 made his action Final. Applicant has duly noted this action and has responded within TWO (2) MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action. Applicant respectfully requests an early advisory action before the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period.
- 8 The Examiner's letter was clear and well written. The undersigned had no questions and made no attempt to contact the Examiner. The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Ghassem Alie for the offer of availability and for the alternate means of communications for reaching the Examiner and Supervisor Allan Shoap.

In Summary

In view of the above, Applicants submit that claims 2, 7-9, 11, and 12 remaining in the application are in condition for allowance and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited.

UTILITY PATENT

Attorney Docket No. MGM-0194

Response to Office Action Mailed: April 5, 2006

Please direct any calls in connection with this application to the undersigned at (510) 832-4111.

Date: APRIL 25, 2006


Reg. No.: 22,448

Tel. No.: 510-832-4111

Fax No.: 510-832-4115

Customer No.: 498

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "James R. Cypher", written over a horizontal line.

James R. Cypher

Law Offices of James R. Cypher

405 14th Street

Suite 1607

Oakland, CA 94612